



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/782,443	02/19/2004	Messaoud Benantar	AUS920031055US1	5639
45371 7590 07/16/2008 IBM CORPORATION (RUS) c/o Rudolf O Siegesmund Gordon & Rees, LLP 2100 Ross Avenue Suite 2800 DALLAS, TX 75201				
EXAMINER HOFTMAN, BRANDON S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2136				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/16/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/782,443

Applicant(s)

BENANTAR ET AL.

Examiner

BRANDON S. HOFFMAN

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-24 are pending in this office action.
2. Applicant's arguments, filed December 4, 2007, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boydston et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,839,708) in view of Pallante (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0028495).

Regarding claims 1, 9, 10, and 18, Boydston et al. teaches a programmable apparatus/web service architecture/computer readable memory/method for authenticating and authorizing a service request sent from a service client to a service provider, comprising:

- A processor (fig. 1, ref. num 32);
- A memory (fig. 1, ref. num 48);

- An authorization database in the memory (fig. 2, ref. num 40);
- A service request filter program in the memory directing the processor to receive an incoming service request from the service client on a communication channel (col. 7, lines 55-60);
- Extract a service client identifier from the digital certificate associated with the service request (col. 8, lines 17-36);
- Store the service client identifier in the memory (col. 8, lines 17-36, the identifier is stored in memory for later comparison); and
- Send the service request on the communication channel to a web service manager (col. 9, lines 1-6);
- A service client authentication program in the memory directing the processor to responsive to receiving an authentication request from a web service manager, match the service client identifier with a service client record in the authorization database having the same service client identifier (col. 8, line 60 through col. 9, line 12); and
- Responsive to matching the service client identifier with a record in the authorization database, call a service authorization program in the memory (col. 9, lines 9);
- Wherein the service authorization program directs the processor to determine if the service client identifier associated with the service request is authorized to access the service provider; and responsive to determining that the service

request is authorized, authorize the service provider to process the request (col. 9, lines 9-28).

Boydston et al. does not teach the service request having a digital certificate attached.

Pallante teaches the service request having a digital certificate attached (paragraph 0065).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine attaching a digital certificate to a service request, as taught by Pallante, with the programmable apparatus/web service architecture/computer readable memory/method of Boydston et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because a digital certificate provides assurance that the person requesting service is indeed who they say they are.

Regarding claims 2, 11, and 19, Boydston et al. as modified by Pallante teaches wherein the service request filter program further directs the processor to authenticate the digital certificate with the issuing certification authority (see paragraph 0075 of Pallante).

Regarding claims 3, 12, and 20, Boydston et al. as modified by Pallante teaches wherein the digital certificate is an X.509 digital certificate (see paragraph 0099 of Pallante).

Regarding claims 4, 13, and 21, Boydston et al. as modified by Pallante teaches wherein the service client identifier is a Distinguished Name (see paragraph 0099 of Pallante).

Regarding claims 5, 14, and 22, Boydston et al. as modified by Pallante teaches wherein the digital certificate is self-signed (see paragraph 0062 of Pallante).

Regarding claims 6, 15, and 23, Boydston et al. as modified by Pallante teaches further comprising an authorization log (see col. 9, line 64 through col. 10, line 6 of Boydston et al.).

Regarding claims 7, 16, and 24, Boydston et al. as modified by Pallante teaches wherein the service client authentication program further records the service client identifier in the authorization log (see col. 10, lines 6-17 of Boydston et al.).

Regarding claims 8 and 17, Boydston et al. as modified by Pallante teaches wherein the service authorization program further records the service client identifier and service request in the authorization log (see col. 10, lines 6-17 of Boydston et al.).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant argues Pallante does not teach the service request having a digital signature attached (page 7 of remarks).

Regarding applicant's argument, examiner disagrees. Column 8, lines 17-36 of Boydstun et al., teaches that any type of authentication and authorization can take place for restricting access to selected content to authenticated users. The use of certificates, as taught by Pallante is one such method for ensuring proper authorization. Replacing Boydstun et al. authorization method with the specific authorization method of Pallante (using certificates), arrives at the claimed invention. Paragraph 0072-0073 of Pallante describe the use of certificates in authorizing users.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2136

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRANDON S. HOFFMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-3863. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser G. Moazzami can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Brandon S Hoffman/
Examiner, Art Unit 2136

Application/Control Number: 10/782,443

Page 8

Art Unit: 2136

/Nasser G Moazzami/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2136